Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/028,129	LANDRY-COLTRAIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pamela R. Schwartz	1774
All Participants:	Status of Application	•
(1) <u>Pamela R. Schwartz</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Konkol</u> .	(4)	•
Date of Interview: 26 September 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applican	•	
Part I.		:
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1, 2, 6-9, 11-14, 18, 25, 29-34, 36, 37, 40, 42 and 46		
Prior art documents discussed: Maeda et al.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief such as the second control of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. 	on. The examiner will provide a parate record of the substance o	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
Det of mixe		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Because the language of claims 1 and 46 that "at least 68% of said particles" was not relied upon to overcome the prior art, the language concerning "68%" is being deleted from the claims. Other agreed upon modifications are being made to clarify the claims and to add the amendments that were submitted on 8/20/07 but were not entered are being added. The submitted amendment to the specification is unnecessary and is not being entered. Other amendments to clarify the specification have been agreed to. See the Examiner's amendment.